

REMARKS

Thorough examination and careful review of the application by the Examiner is noted and appreciated.

Claims 1-12 are pending in the application. Claims 1-6 and 8-12 are rejected.

The indication that claim 7 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten into independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, is further noted and appreciated.

New claims 13-17 have been added for the Examiner consideration. New independent claim 13 is equivalent to claim 7 being rewritten into independent form to include all of the limitations of base claim 1 and the intervening claim 2. Dependent claims 14-17 are substantially similar to the existing claims 3, 4, 5 and 6. The Applicants respectfully submit that, as indicated by the Examiner, the newly added claim 13 and its dependent claims 14-17, are believed to be allowable.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §112**

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

The specification, page 15, paragraph 0034, has been amended to recite the limitation of the "indicator means" claimed in claim 11.

The rejection of claim 11 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, is respectfully traversed. A reconsideration for allowance of claim 11 is respectfully requested of the Examiner.

Claims 4-6 and 8-12 are rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Numerous abnormalities of the claim language were pointed out by the Examiner.

Claims 1 and 8 have been amended to alleviate the Examiner's rejections for claims 4-6 and 8-12. A reconsideration for allowance of these claims is respectfully requested of the Examiner.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §102**

Claims 1-3, 8, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Muka '796. It is contended that Muka shows substantially the present invention structure as recited in independent claims 1 and 8.

Independent claims 1 and 8 have been amended to further recite the limitations contained in dependent claims 4 and 9, respectively. Claims 4 and 9 have been cancelled and withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner. The newly amended independent claims 1 and 8, and their dependent claims 2-3 and 8, 12, are therefore not anticipated by Muka '796. A reconsideration for allowance of these claims is respectfully requested of the Examiner.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103**

Claims 1-6, 8-10 and 12 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art shown in Figures 1-3 of the instant application in view of Muka et al '276. It is contended that the prior art assembly shown in Figures 1-3 of the instant application contains all of the structural limitations as broadly recited in the claims, except the ledge means being linearly actuatable and operable when engaged linearly by a latch key, and such linear actuator is taught by Muka '276.

The rejection of claims 1-6, 8-10 and 12 under 35 USC §103(a) based on the admitted prior art and Muka et al is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1, in its newly amended form, contains the additional limitation of:

"said latch means further comprises two latch holes for linearly engaging said latch key of the door opener in said loadport".

The Applicants respectfully submit that such is not taught or disclosed by the admitted prior art or Muka, either singularly or in combination thereof.

The rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 USC §103(a) based on the admitted prior art and Muka et al '276 is respectfully traversed. A reconsideration for allowance of these claims is respectfully requested of the Examiner.

Independent claim 8, in its newly amended form, further recites the limitation of:

"four locking tabs with two situated on one of two opposing sides of said cover member for engaging receptacles provided in said body member".

The Applicants respectfully submit that such limitation is not taught or disclosed by the admitted prior art nor Muka, either singularly or in combination thereof.

U.S.S.N. 10/072,704

The rejection of claims 8-10 and 12 under 35 USC §103(a) based on the admitted prior art and Muka et al '276 is respectfully traversed. A reconsideration for allowance of these claims is respectfully requested of the Examiner.

Based on the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims, i.e. claims 1-3, 5-8 and 10-17, are now in condition for allowance. Such favorable action by the Examiner at an early date is respectfully solicited.

In the event that the present invention is not in a condition for allowance for any other reasons, the Examiner is respectfully invited to call the Applicants' representative at his Bloomfield Hills, Michigan office at (248) 540-4040 such that necessary action may be taken to place the application in a condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Tung & Associates



---

Randy W. Tung  
Reg. No. 31,311  
Telephone: (248) 540-4040

RWT\kd